

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 9 and 12-18. In the Office Action, claims 9 and 12-18 stand rejected. In this Response, no claims have been amended, cancelled or added. Thus, claims 9 and 12-18 are pending in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

In Office Action paragraph 2, claims 9 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eslambolchi et al. (US 5,875,422). In Office Action paragraph 4, claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eslambolchi et al. in view of Shaffer et al. (US 6,240,170). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

One example of Applicant's invention will be described with reference to Fig. 2. A communication system KS-A has a calling terminal device EG-A set with a particular language, for example, German. Selector information SI-A identifying the German language for the calling terminal device EG-A is stored in a database DB-A of the communication system KS-A.

Another communication system KS-B has a called terminal device EG-B set with another particular language, for example, English. Selector information SI-B identifying the English language configuration for the called terminal device EG-B is stored in a database DB-B in the communication system KS-B. Because the languages of the calling terminal device EG-A (Germany) and the called terminal device EG-B (English) are different, language translation is required for proper communication between the terminal devices EG-A, EG-B.

Applicant's invention provides for identification of the different languages of the terminal devices EG-A, EG-B and automatic language translation for proper communication.

When the calling terminal device EG-A calls the called terminal device EG-B, the stored selector information SI-A indicating the German language is transmitted to the communication system KS-B. The communication system KS-B identifies the German language set for the calling terminal device EG-A by the received selector information SI-A. The communication system KS-B checks the selector information SI-B in the database DB-B and identifies the

English language set for the called terminal device EG-B. The communication system KS-B then determines that the languages are different and automatically loops-in a language translator.

Turning to Applicant's claim 9, claim 9 pertains to a method in a communication system (KS-B) for translating messages that are directed to a called subscriber (EG-B) into a language that is dependent upon the called subscriber (EG-B). Claim 9 calls for the step of storing selector information (SI-B) designating a language that is allocated to a relevant subscriber (EG-B) for internal subscribers in the communication system (KS-B). Claim 9 also calls for the step of forming the selector information (SI-B) dependent on the language of the display text for the dialogue operator interface (DBO) that is selected by a subscriber (EG-B). Further, the method has the step of comparing the selector information (SI-A) of a calling subscriber (EG-A), when a connection is set up, to the selector information (SI-B) of the called subscriber (EG-B). Claim 9 also calls for automatically activating a loop-in function, when items of the selector information (SI-A) of the calling subscriber (EG-A) differs from the selector information (SI-B) in the called subscriber (EG-B), which effects an insertion of a translator (TRSS, TRTT) into the connection.

The reference letters inserted into the above claim text and referred to in the above example of Applicant's invention is for reference purposes to the specification and drawings, and is not intended to limit the claims.

Applicant's invention automatically loops-in a language translator based on a comparison of the selector information from the calling subscriber to the stored selector information of the called subscriber. Applicant's invention eliminates the need for a user to input or activate a request for the language translator after initiation of the call.

Turning to Eslambolchi et al., Eslambolchi et al. requires input or action by the user to implement or loop-in the language translator. Column 3, lines 15-27 of Eslambolchi et al. clearly describes a required input from the user to invoke the language translation service. Following entry by the calling party of the number of the called party, the front end processor 26 prompts the calling party to enter a language translation preference for the speech of the called party. Typically, the front end processor 26 provides the calling party with an announcement of the form "Dial or speak one for English, two for French, three for German etc." Similarly, Eslambolchi et al. at column 3, lines 28-41 describes a voice prompt provided to the calling party

to select a language preference for translation. The called party responds by providing input to select the language preference. Thus, Eslambolchi et al. requires user input to invoke the language translation service and does not automatically loop-in a translator. Eslambolchi et al. does refer to automatic language translation; however, the "automatic" nature of the translation is a computer generated translation. See Eslambolchi et al., column 3, lines 42-51. The "automatic" language translator via computer of Eslambolchi et al. is merely a computer generated translation after manual input of a user request for the translation. The language translation in Eslambolchi et al. is not automatically activated as claimed in Applicant's claim 9.

As to claim 18, Applicant submits claim 18 is also allowable for similar reasons.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the § 102 and § 103 rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance and requests a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Michael S. Leonard
Reg. No. 37,557
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4270

Dated: June 21, 2004